



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,245	04/26/2000	Charles Calvin Byers	35	2382

22046 7590 07/20/2004

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219
HOLMDEL, NJ 07733

EXAMINER

LONSBERRY, HUNTER B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/560,245

Applicant(s)

BYERS, CHARLES CALVIN

Examiner

Hunter B. Lonsberry

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14-17, 19, 20, 24-27, 29, 30, 32-35, 37, 38, 40-43, 45, 46 and 48 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 22 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-4,6,7,9-11,14-17,19,20,22,24-27,29,30,32-35,37,38,40-43,45,46 and 48.

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The indicated allowability of claims 8, 13, 21, 23, 31, 39 and 47 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Abecassis. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11, 14-17, 19,20, 24-27, 29, 30, 32-35, 37, 38, 40-43, 45, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,357,042 to Srinivasan in view of U.S Patent 6, 684,194 to Elderling and U.S. Patent 6,553,178 to Abecassis.

Regarding claims 1-3, 9, 10, 16, and 48 Srinivasan discloses a tracking module 13 which tracks a number of pixels in a video image via tracking box 29, substitute logos or images may be placed in the tracking box as annotation data and may be transmitted over a broadband network/WAN (column 6, lines 7-18, column 7, line 7-column 9, line 30, column 13, lines 1-40, column 14, lines 27-

Art Unit: 2611

55). Srinivasan doesn't disclose altering an image characteristic with a replacement digital image based upon a user profile, but does disclose that different ads may be inserted based upon different profiles which are transmitted to a user from ad server (column 30, lines 6-15 lines 28-40, line 63-column column 32, line 2, lines 57-67, Figure 17).

Srinivasan does not disclose the use of time of day information or parental consent information.

Elderling discloses a system which utilizes user profiles, and may recognize a specific user based upon time of day information column 3, line 4-column 5, line 55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the tracking module of Srinivasan to replace the data within tracking box 29 with different advertisements based upon a profile in order to provide advertisements which would be of the most interest to a specific viewer and to utilize the time of day profiling information as taught by Elderling to insure that the current profile matches the viewer watching the current program.

Elderling fails to disclose parental consent information as part of a profile.

Abecassis discloses a profiling system which includes parental consent information, a parent may set the levels of acceptable violence, bloodshed, profanity and nudity for other profiles (Figures 4a-E, 1d, column 8, lines 30-41, column 17, lines 50-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious to modify the profiling systems of Srinivasan and Elderling to include parental consent information as part of a profile, as taught by Abecassis, thus preventing a child from watching

Art Unit: 2611

objectionable material, and enabling older children to watch age appropriate programming.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 27, 29, 30, 35, 37, 38, 43, 45 and 46, Srinivasan discloses a system, which utilizes user profiles.

Srinivasan doesn't disclose whether the profiles contain demographic, advertising or geographic information. The examiner takes official notice that profiles including advertising, geographic, time of day, and demographics are well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify Srinivasan to include time of day, demographic, advertising or geographic information to the profiles in order to better reach a target profile with advertising.

Regarding claims 24 and 40, Srinivasan discloses a tracking module 13 which tracks a number of pixels in a video image via tracking box 29, substitute logos or images may be placed in the tracking box as annotation data, Figure 12 details customer equipment 115, which includes a display device, and import ports 125 and 127 which receive a program and annotation data which may be stored in ram and operated on via a CPU (Figure 7, 12, column 6, lines 7-18, column 7, line 7-column 9, line 30, column 13, lines 1-40, column 14, lines 27-55, column 20, line 54-column 22, line 9). Srinivasan inherently contains a DSP and video processor, as a DSP/video processor is required to insert the replacement annotation data.

Srinivasan doesn't disclose altering an image characteristic with a replacement digital image based upon a user profile, but does disclose that

Art Unit: 2611

different ads may be inserted based upon different profiles which are transmitted to a user from the ad server (column 30, lines 6-15 lines 28-40, line 63-column column 32, line 2, lines 57-67, Figure 17). Srinivasan does not disclose the use of time of day information or parental consent information.

Elderling discloses a system which utilizes user profiles, and may recognize a specific user based upon time of day information column 3, line 4-column 5, line 55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the tracking module of Srinivasan to replace the data within tracking box 29 with different advertisements based upon a profile in order to provide advertisements which would be of the most interest to a specific viewer and to utilize the time of day profiling information as taught by Elderling to insure that the current profile matches the viewer watching the current program.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the tracking module of Srinivasan to replace the data within tracking box 29 with different advertisements based upon a profile in order to provide advertisements which would be of the most interest to a specific viewer.

Elderling fails to disclose parental consent information.

Abecassis discloses a profiling system which includes parental consent information, a parent may set the levels of acceptable violence, bloodshed, profanity and nudity for other profiles (Figures 4a-E, 1d, column 8, lines 30-41, column 17, lines 50-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious to modify the profiling systems of Srinivasan and Elderling to include parental consent information as part of a profile in a database, as taught by Abecassis, thus preventing a child from watching objectionable material, and enabling older children to watch age appropriate programming.

Regarding claims 25, 33, and 41 Srinivasan discloses the use of VRAM 139 to carry a combined video image (column 21, lines 27-67).

Regarding claims 26, 34, and 42, Srinivasan inherently has a video processor, which is controlled by a CPU, as a CPU is required to control a video processor in order to assemble the annotation and video data.

Regarding claim 32, Srinivasan discloses a tracking module 13 which tracks a number of pixels in a video image via tracking box 29, substitute logos or images may be placed in the tracking box as annotation data, Figure 12 details customer equipment 115, which includes a display device, and import ports 125 and 127 which receive a program and annotation data from authoring station 51 and may be stored in ram and operated on via a CPU (Figure 7, 12, column 6, lines 7-18, column 7, line 7-column 9, line 30, column 13, lines 1-40, column 14, lines 27-55, column 20, line 54-column 22, line 9). Srinivasan inherently contains a DSP and video processor, as a DSP/video processor is required to insert the replacement annotation data.

Srinivasan doesn't disclose altering an image characteristic with a replacement digital image based upon a user profile or a multicast router, but does disclose that different ads may be inserted based upon different profiles

Art Unit: 2611

which are transmitted to a user from the ad server, a modified video stream may be transferred over a WAN (column 30, lines 6-15 lines 28-40, line 63-column column 32, line 2, lines 57-67, Figure 17). Srinivasan does not disclose the use of time of day information or parental consent information.

Elderling discloses a system which utilizes user profiles, and may recognize a specific user based upon time of day information column 3, line 4-column 5, line 55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the tracking module of Srinivasan to replace the data within tracking box 29 with different advertisements based upon a profile in order to provide advertisements which would be of the most interest to a specific viewer and to utilize the time of day profiling information as taught by Elderling to insure that the current profile matches the viewer watching the current program.

Elderling fails to disclose parental consent information as part of a profile.

Abecassis discloses a profiling system which includes parental consent information, a parent may set the levels of acceptable violence, bloodshed, profanity and nudity for other profiles within the database (Figures 4a-E, 1d, column 8, lines 30-41, column 17, lines 50-56).

Therefore it would have been obvious to modify the profiling systems of Srinivasan and Elderling to include parental consent information as part of a profile within a database, as taught by Abecassis, thus preventing a child from watching objectionable material, and enabling older children to watch age appropriate programming.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent 5,758,257 to Herz: System and Method for Scheduling Broadcast of an Access to Video Programs and Other Data Using Customer Profiles.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hunter B. Lonsberry whose telephone number is 703-305-3234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday during normal business hours.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/560,245
Art Unit: 2611

Page 9

HBL



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER